

planning support to both Public and Private Sector Clients."

Who is able to monitor effectively (and how) the inevitable practical conflicts of interest between Re Ltd.'s inter-twined Public and Private Sector Clients?

My two current planning department problems are, briefly, as follows:

1. A 2015 planning application, 15/04207/FUL (dealt with originally by the Council's current Head of Development Management, [REDACTED]), to build two houses in the back garden of a property next door to my own at [REDACTED] showed, extraordinarily, on one of the submitted plans, that the applicant proposed to demolish a large tree in the centre of our private freehold garden (and also to do other tree work in our garden). This was despite the Application form having stated that there would be only "on-site" work, i.e. only in their Application site alone. We had also never been approached by the Applicant or anyone else about this, and would certainly never have given permission for such work to be done in our private garden. .

The Application was approved on 28 August 2015, on Officer's recommendation. I have written to four officers about this: [REDACTED] Area Planning Manager, Finchley & Golders Green, and (on the advice of a duty planning officer), to [REDACTED] tree officer - all to no avail.

[REDACTED] letter to me, on 18 April 2017 (replying to my letter to [REDACTED]), includes the following: "...agree that the application form is incorrect..."; "The approval of planning permission does not necessarily allow works to be carried out on someone else's land for which permission of the owner may be required..."; "..... officers have attached conditions to ensure that there is the best possible chance (!!!) of trees being retained..."; and his punch-line: "...This would be a civil matter between the two parties" - that is to say, a civil matter between ourselves and the developer!

In other words, planning officers, having wrongly approved the next-door developer's proposal to carry out "off-site" work in our private garden while applying only for "on-site" work, now intend to remove themselves entirely from the picture. Our only remedy for this situation, [REDACTED] says, is for us to commence a private legal action against the developer!

WE would have to sue the developer in order to put right the Council's error (whether this error was accidental or deliberate).

CONCLUSION: Either deliberately, or through sheer incompetence, or through a determination to conceal their errors, the interests of planning officers are the same, here, as those of the developer: to stop us from pressing to save our trees in our private garden from the next-door developer. We would have to take the developer to court; officers' actions in this matter are, apparently, irrelevant. **Where** is the clear dividing line, here (if any), between the interests of the **Client** (Barnet plus Contractor Re Ltd) and the other Contractor (the developer)? **Who**, if anyone on the Council's staff, is in a position to ensure accountability?

2. The conversion of the 1850s house at [REDACTED] into flats was approved on 29 July 2014. This is one of the 31 surviving old Freehold Land Association houses in Friern Park about which I wrote in my book [REDACTED]. The approval had been on condition that the facade was not altered. A Finchley & Golders Green Area planning officer wrote to me in July 2014 that the decision did not preclude further applications for the site "and you will be notified should this occur."

I contacted Enforcement in late January 2017 about some "repair" changes taking place to the facade and received a satisfactory written reply. Seven weeks later, on 4 April, I wrote to Enforcement pointing out that a large protruding roof window ("dormer") had appeared, "facing forwards into the road". I asked whether planning permission had been given for this, and if so, why notice of the proposed amendment had not been sent to myself or other relevant persons. The